

May 7, 2010

TO: Provost's Council

FROM: Judith M. Bowman
Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Studies

SUBJ: Provost's Council Agenda for Tuesday, May 11

The Provost's Council will meet on Tuesday, May 11 at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Room in Koch Hall. The following agenda items will be discussed.

1. Approval of the April 13 minutes (see attachment, p. 1-3)
2. Business Gateway Project
Tom Osha and Jerry Robertson
3. Reinstatement Policy for Graduate Students (see attachment, p. 4-6)
4. Process for Certification of Graduate Faculty (see attachment, p. 7)
5. GPD Guidelines (additional revision from Committee C) (see attachment, p. 8-11)
6. Office of Distance Learning Revenue Sharing Model (see attachments, p. 12-17)
7. Approval of Academic Program Review Process for 2010-15
8. Announcements
 - A. Academic Calendar for 2012-13 (see attachment, p. 18)
 - B. Student Opinion Surveys
 - C. Deadline for WEAVE reports for 2009-10 is August 1, 2010

PROVOST'S COUNCIL
May 11, 2010
Minutes

The Provost's Council met on Tuesday, May 11, 2010 from 8:30-10:00 a.m. in the Board Room in Koch Hall. Those present were Carol Simpson (Chair), Nancy Bagranoff, Andrew Balas, Oktay Baysal, Andy Casiello, Paul Champagne, Kurt Gaubatz, Bill Graves, Heather Huling, Janet Katz, Phil Langlais, Bill McMahon, Sara Morris, Ginny O'Herron, Tom Osha, Chris Platsoucas, Jerry Robertson, Marty Sharpe, Mary Swartz, and Charles Wilson. The following agenda items were discussed.

1. The April 17 minutes were approved.
2. Business Gateway Project

Tom Osha and Jerry Robertson met with Council members to describe the Business Gateway Project. The Business Gateway builds on the success of the Virginia Applied Technology and Professional Development Center and is designed to provide a single, consistent entry point to the intellectual capital, innovative technologies and infrastructure of the University. The mission of the ODU Business Gateway is to provide companies large and small, not-for-profit organizations, military commands and entrepreneurs a dedicated resource to help solve business problems, expand capabilities and create new ventures. The project will be beneficial by making the University more business friendly, serving as a magnet for companies to locate in the University's Innovative Research Park, boosting economic development efforts, providing additional research and development opportunities for faculty, and creating additional University revenue for investment.

3. Reinstatement Policy for Graduate Students

Council members discussed and approved the revision of the Reinstatement Policy for Graduate Students. The student is responsible for initiating all aspects of the request for reinstatement to the University. The first-level decision of reinstatement for students will be made by the graduate program director, and the Graduate Appeals Committee will function as the second level of appeal, making it a true appeals committee. The decision of the Graduate Appeals Committee will be final. The Council's recommendation will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review.

4. Process for Certification of Graduate Faculty

Phil Langlais presented the proposed process for the colleges to assume responsibility for graduate faculty certification. The recommended procedures to be followed by the colleges were described. Carol Simpson asked that item 6 of the procedures be revised to indicate that a copy of the certification form be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs. Along with the procedures, the proposed process identified several areas that need action. Those areas are as follows.

- Revise College forms for “Certification of Faculty for Graduate Instruction.”
- Develop college specific coding of graduate instruction certification as well as start and end dates for certification term.
- Develop college-level certificate screen in the Faculty Activity System.
- Deans need to provide access to activity screen for appropriate individuals.
- Meetings needed with Marty Sharpe and the Associate Deans to discuss SACS requirements and how to address items 3 and 4, above.

Marty Sharpe emphasized that the certifications are good for up to five years and that beginning and ending dates will be needed. She also noted that exceptions should be made only in exceptional circumstances and reminded the Deans to review the Policy on Academic and Professional Preparation Requirements for Faculty. Phil Langlais will send the Deans the beginning and ending dates in the database that has been maintained in Academic Affairs.

Carol Simpson asked the Deans to ensure the criteria for graduate certification are stated clearly, published and consistent with University policy. She also noted that the University policy needs to be reviewed. The deadline for publishing the college criteria for graduate faculty certification was set for October 31, 2010. Dr. Sharpe asked the Deans to let her know when the college policies are published.

5. GPD Guidelines

Council members discussed the responsibilities of Graduate Program Directors with the most recent revisions proposed by Faculty Senate Committee C. Council members agreed with the revision to the section on Appointment that specifies Graduate Program Directors and their supervisors should develop a written description that provides a clear understanding of the expectations for both parties about their duties and the attendant compensations. Council members recommended that information on the criteria for annual evaluations be added to this section.

Council members did not agree with the revision from Committee C to the section on released time, which states that apart from exceptional circumstances, a Graduate Program Director normally is provided with a minimum of three credit hours of released time per semester, or a 25 percent reduction in load for this function. The Deans felt this was too prescriptive and took away needed flexibility, especially in times of budget constraints. Kurt Gaubatz responded that faculty felt strongly about the issue of released time.

The recommendation on GPD responsibilities will be returned to the Senate, along with a listing of graduate programs at the University and the amount of released time awarded to Graduate Program Directors in each, for additional review and discussion.

6. Office of Distance Learning Revenue Sharing Model

Andy Casiello discussed the draft document on tuition distribution for complete online degree programs. He acknowledged that discussion will be needed to determine what will constitute a totally online program. Included with the revenue sharing document was a sample course showing the tuition distribution. The revenue sharing model is intended to allow the University to increase and grow its online programs; existing online programs will be included. Faculty will be rewarded for their work and the Deans will receive a small amount in the tuition distribution. Bill Graves felt that the recommended tuition distribution will not work in his College. He also suggested that the last sentence in section E. be changed so that the annual report explaining the use of the funds would be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.

The revenue sharing model will be discussed again at a future meeting. Carol Simpson expressed her desire to have formal acceptance of a policy by the fall.

7. Approval of Academic Program Review Process for 2010-15

Marty Sharpe will send a draft of the academic program review process to the Deans for comment.

8. Announcements/Reminders

- A. The 2012-13 academic calendar was included for informational purposes.
- B. Student opinion surveys will be discussed at the next meeting.
- C. The Deans were reminded that the deadline for WEAVE reports for 2009-10 is August 1, 2010.